




**Congressional
Record
Convicts
U.N.**



By MYRON C. FAGAN

Published by
CINEMA EDUCATIONAL GUILD, INC.

Organized to Combat Communism

MYRON C. FAGAN, NATIONAL DIRECTOR

MAY-JUNE, 1957 - News-Bulletin

CONTENTS:

- 1) **JOE — HALLOWED BE THY NAME!**
 - 2) **“McCarthyism” — A Badge of Honor!**
 - 3) **Tribute From a Great Soldier**
 - 4) **U.S. Or UN — Only One Can Survive!**
 - 5) **Congressman Burdick Confirms.**
 - 6) **TREASON!**
 - 7) **It Was Planned That Way.**
 - 8) **Proof UN IS MVD HDQS. in U.S.**
 - 9) **The So-Called “Civil Rights Bill”**
 - 10) **How YOU Can Defeat It.**
-

JOE - HALLOWED BE THY NAME!

Joe McCarthy has gone to his Mansion in Heaven!

And God smiled upon him . . . and all the Angels were singing . . . and waiting there for him were George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, and Patrick Henry and Ben Franklin, and all those other Valiants who gave us this once God-blessed land—waiting there to greet and welcome the gallant one who cheerfully gave his earthly life to preserve what they had given us.

Yes, Joe is dead. That is, his flesh is dead—but in the hearts of all true Americans his spirit will live forever . . . and in our darkest hours—and there *will* be such hours—the memory of Joe McCarthy will give us new courage and new strength to go on and on and on to final victory!

And for those who hounded him to his death—the alien and native renegades, the Lehmans and the Baruchs, the Flanders and the Watkins, and the Judas in the White House—Joe will be a different kind of memory, the uneasy memory that has ever since plagued the seed of the Pharisees who screamed for the liberation of Barabbas and for the crucifixion of Jesus. Archbishop Patrick O'Boyle pronounced that kind of a memory for them with his opening invocation from that centuries old liturgy of the dead:

“Judica me, Deus, et discerne causam meam de gente non sancto—Ab homine iniquo et dolosa erue me.”

(Give judgement for me, O God, and decide my cause against an unholy people. From unjust and deceitful men deliver me.)

Like Judas, all of them will forever lie uneasy in their graves!

“McCARTHYISM” - A BADGE OF HONOR!

From the day that Joe McCarthy emerged as their Nemesis, all those in the Great Conspiracy to destroy America frantically sought for a word that would discredit him and his great crusade in the eyes of the world—a nickname that would express all the abhorrence of Anathema. And they coined the word “McCarthyism”. It was intended to denote all the evil of hell. They spread that word through-

out the world. It became an idiom. And, like Pontius Pilate, even those who could see no wrong in the man seized upon that word to express dislike for "his methods".

Now Joe's death has immortalized that word. And as the days go on and his works become truly understood, and all of his predictions come true, that word, "McCarthyism", will become his halo—and for those who will carry on in his spirit it will become a sacred badge of honor. His enemies know that—and from now on those who coined that word will try to make us forget it.

But those of us who knew Joe McCarthy for what he was—and what he forever will be—must never let the the world forget the word "McCarthyism" . . . we must make that word our Battle Cry in our fight for God and Country! . . . we must make the Enemy dread that word as once they gleefully used it to defame and to vilify—and to silence the blind and the timid.

"McCARTHYISM" is now the word for FREEDOM!

●

TRIBUTE FROM A GREAT SOLDIER

●

Joe's death brought forth an avalanche of eulogies. Some were genuine. Some were spurious—*phony* is the truer word. Expressing contempt for the phony ones would be a waste of time and space. But even among the most sincere eulogizers there were many who left me cold—why did they wait for death before they voiced their eulogies?—why didn't they shout their approval and support while he was living?

However, there is one tribute that makes up for all—and offsets even the vicious "condolence" from the little tin soldier in the White House. This tribute came from another soldier—a *real* one: General George E. Stratemeyer.

●

"TO ALL FREEDOM-LOVING AMERICANS

●

"May 2nd, 1957, should bring sadness to every Freedom-Loving American, for on that date America lost Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, one of our greatest fighting sons. Senator McCarthy brought evil (Communism) to the attention of the citizens of the United States of America more than any other one American. He was killed by the anti-Christ movement in the world, particularly here in these United

States of America. But he was not destroyed. His great Patriotism and Americanism will live on forever.

"I know of nothing more fitting than to set up a Living Memorial to him. This has been started by Fulton Lewis, Jr., 1627 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. This Living Memorial Fund is known as The Joe McCarthy Memorial Fund and is for the support of Mrs. Joseph R. (Jean) McCarthy and her daughter, Tierney.

"I, therefore, urge and recommend that every American who signed one of our anti-censure petitions for the Ten Million American drive send at least one dollar to Fulton Lewis, Jr. at the above given address.

**"GEORGE E. STRATEMEYER
Lt. General, USAF, (Retired)"**

No words of mine can add to the lustre of that eulogy. All I will say is: God bless all of you who respond to that appeal.

U. S. OR UN - ONLY ONE CAN SURVIVE!

At long last we have *official* evidence, published in the Congressional Record, that the UN has been planted in the U.S. to destroy the sovereignty of our nation . . . to destroy our Freedoms . . . that the UN charter was written and devised to supplant our Constitution.

It is, *and always has been*, commonly known that the UN Charter was devised and written by Alger Hiss, the most despicable traitor in American history, in collaboration with Moscow's Molotov, the most ruthless enemy of the United States. Yet, for some inexplicable reason, the vast majority of the American people attach no significance to that fact.

In late 1946, at the behest of Senator Vandenberg and other Solons, I wrote a play (THIEVES' PARADISE) in which I revealed the entire plot in detail. That play revealed that the UN was a Trojan Horse sneaked into the United States to serve as an untouchable sanctuary for Red Spies, Saboteurs and American Traitors . . . *how* it was to destroy our Freedoms through "Treaties" such as GENOCIDE . . . to drain us of our wealth through UNRRA, the Marshall Plan and various "Foreign Aid" giveaways . . . to gradually have the UN Charter supplant our Constitution—and, finally, to transform the U.S. into an enslaved unit of a Communist One-World

(UN) Government.

But the vilest, foulest, most horrifying of all the features in the plot, *as fully revealed in the play*, was the secret agreement between Hiss and Molotov under which the post of Chief of the UN Military Secretariat was PERMANENTLY to be held by a Moscow Communist! And in the play it was established why that post was the most important one in the UN, to wit:

At the secret meetings in Yalta the plotters agreed that there was to be no Major (Third World) war. They planned to conquer the great countries by stealth, through intrigue and internal treason—the small countries by force. It was assumed, however, that some of the small countries would fight—especially such countries as were headed by men like Syngman Rhee and Chiang Kai Chek. Hence, there were bound to be “little wars” in Korea, Indo-China and other parts of the world. All such “little wars” would be called UN “Police Actions” and would come under the jurisdiction of the Chief of the UN Military Staff Committee. Therefore it was vital that the Chief of that military Secretariat be a GREAT CONSPIRACY man . . . so Alger Hiss and Molotov entered into that secret agreement.

The saga of “Thieves’ Paradise”, and how my efforts to produce it with all its charges intact were frustrated by the Reds and the Great Conspiracy, are too well known to require repetition in this issue. Likewise as to what happened in Washington, D.C., in May 1956, when I finally smashed through all opposition and produced it at the Shubert Theatre in the presence of more than 200 Senators and Representatives.

All those 200 Solons were shocked and rocked by what the play revealed. But to the vast majority of them all the charges were too fantastic and too utterly incredible. Every one of those Solons expected to see me dragged out of that theatre and hurled into the darkest dungeon in Washington—for I had committed rank heresy: I had named the Great and the Holy, Roosevelt, George Catlett Marshall, Dwight D. Eisenhower, as doers of High Treason—as co-conspirators with Hiss and Molotov and Stalin, to destroy the world and their own Country . . . I had named that Holy of Holies, the “United Nations”, as the crux of that conspiracy. The lightest punishment for such heinous “libel” could be no less than imprisonment for life.

But as day succeeded day, and performance followed performance, and all those “sacred cows” remained silent, it became self-evident that those charges were not so fantastic after all. And one by one, a number of the Solons became aroused—and determined

to do something about it. They came to me and asked for my documentary evidence—and discussed procedure with me.

Now, it is commonly known that from the time, in 1949, when we first published the truth about the UN—that it was a trap set up by the Internationalists to destroy the sovereignty of the U.S. and to enslave the American people—many startled people, unable to believe that such treachery could exist, wrote to Henry Cabot Lodge (he called himself “Jr.” in those days), to Eleanor, to other U. S. delegates to the UN, to the State Department and to the Pentagon. And from all those sources came angry denials of the charges in our News-Bulletins and Tracts. True, all the denials were couched in double-talk, all the explanations were ambiguous, but they were cleverly worded and created doubt and confusion in the minds of many of the inquirers.

But at the same time they hurriedly arranged to have “Executive Orders” from the White House, and/or the State Department, and/or the Pentagon, to declare “Top Secret” and *unavailable* the official documents upon which we had based our charges.

I pointed all that out to the Solons who discussed “procedure” with me, and I urged them not to “quote” the charges in “Thieves’ Paradise”, or to credit their findings to our publications, because that would once again enable the Lodges and the Eleanors to “discredit” the validity of their findings. But, I stressed, if they would do their own researching it would give their findings an *official* stamp that *nobody* could refute. All of them saw my point—and agreed that it was sound.

Without going into any further details, on January 17, 1957, after eight long months of arduous research, Congressman Usher L. Burdick (No. Dakota) published his findings in the Congressional Record, as follows:

“CONGRESSIONAL RECORD
“*Proceedings and Debates of the 85th
Congress, First Session*
“*The Russians Are and Will Continue
To be on the Inside of Any Military
Action Taken by the Security Council
of the United Nations*

“EXTENSION OF REMARKS
of
“HON. USHER L. BURDICK
of North Dakota

“IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

“Thursday, January 17, 1957

“Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, there is a situation inherent in the Charter of the United Nations of which I believe very few citizens of the United States are aware. It is highly dangerous to the security and welfare of our Nation and, I believe, should be called to their attention.

“The Secretary of the Security Council Affairs is now a Russian, and the 3 men who have held that position since the Security Council was organized are: A. A. Sobolev, 1946-49; Constantin E. Zinchenko, 1950-53; Ilya S. Tchernychev.

“This means that since the Security Council was organized the Russians, through the secretary, have had close touch with all military plans. The directives to MacArthur and the reports coming from him passed through the hands of this secretary. Now can you realize what MacArthur was up against in trying to win the Korean War? Can you imagine what the commander of the United Nations' Troops in the Suez zone is up against?

“In article 47, paragraph 3, the United Nations Charter states:

“‘The Military Staff Committee shall be responsible through the Security Council for the strategic direction of any Armed Forces placed at the disposal of the Security Council.’

“On January 10, 1957, the State Department informed me that—

“‘The Military Staff Committee is made up of the Chiefs of Staff of the Security Council, five in number. Its chairman rotates every month in alphabetical order, and therefore once every 5 months there is a Russian in charge of the Military Staff Committee.’

“I have repeatedly said that the United Nations can get nowhere with Russia as a member. It is powerless to do anything without troops, and as soon as troops are called the Secretary of the Security Council Affairs gets all the information going out to commanders and coming back from them. How do you like this arrangement?

“This situation of having a Russian on the receiving end of all information as Secretary of the Security Council Affairs was brought about by an agreement made between Alger Hiss and Molotov in London in 1945-46. The agreement has been kept, as a Russian is there today as secretary, and has been since the organization of the United Nations.

“If all the other reasons I have given for the ouster of the Russians

from the United Nations are swept aside, this last reason is unanswerable. If we continue the practice, we can win no war that might start if it is to be checked by the Security Council. What is the use of declaring war or engaging in another Korean Catastrophe? Haven't we commonsense, or are we playing ball with the Russians, and at the same time talking about stopping the spread of communism? What will happen to our troops under this setup if we give the President the power to send them into war without the consent of Congress?

"If we have the least glimmering hope of bringing about world peace, let us oust the Russians and get down to patriotic business. We are in a situation where we are engaged in a cold war against Russia, with a Russian at the helm, getting all the information about troops and supplies, ammunition, and the size of our forces, where they intend to attack, and when.

"I don't suppose I can awaken the sleeping guards of this country to a situation that is steeped in betrayal. Are we men or mice?"

That report by a Member of Congress, published in the official Congressional Record, confirms every charge made in the play, "Thieves' Paradise" and in our "Tract". And, as I previously stressed, every statement in that report is based on Congressman Burdick's personal investigations.

If the American people, *and Congress*, cannot accept it as an *official* report, then they might as well reject the reports issued by the FBI.

As further proof: that report was published more than four months ago, yet neither the UN, nor any of its proponents, *not even Eisenhower*, has denied, or even questioned, any of the charges in that report . . . DO WE NEED ANY FURTHER PROOF?

It is vital that our Congress, especially our Senate, institute a thorough investigation of the "United Nations"—*before any more of our sons are betrayed to death and into foul Communist dungeons in another "UN Police Action"!*

TELL IT TO YOUR SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES!
Tell it to them before your sons die in another "Korea" !!!

—●—
T R E A S O N !
—●—

Treason is a harsh word. It is a reprehensible word when the

charge is lightly made. But when our State Department and *all* our Government Agencies combine to conceal from the American people the flagrant and scornful violations of our laws by the UN, what else can it be called but treason? . . . when they condone the murder of innocent American citizens by drunken Red thugs who are here as delegates to the UN, what else can it be called but treason? . . . when Congress meekly acquiesces to UNESCO's taxing the American people for the money with which to brainwash our school children, what else can it be called but TREASON?

Now let me show you why I call it treason:

●

IT WAS ALL PLANNED THAT WAY

●

Shortly after Mister Truman hurled us into that "UN Police Action" in Korea we issued a "News-Bulletin" which we called "UN IS U. S. CANCER".

It was in that "News-Bulletin" that we stressed that infamous Hiss-Molotov secret agreement under which the Chief of the UN Military secretariat was *always* to be a Moscow Red . . . we warned that *every* "UN Police Action", such as Korea, would be a death trap for our American sons . . . we charged, in plain and direct language, that the UN was set up to be a sacrosanct sanctuary for Red Spies and Saboteurs and American traitors . . . we proclaimed that the Russian delegation to the UN (*as are all Communist Embassies and Consulates*) was nothing more nor less than an MVD outpost in the United States!

And we charged that it had been planned that way at the meeting in Yalta!

●

P R O O F

●

After Hiss and his co-conspirators had worked out their scheme to plant the UN Trojan Horse within the U. S., Congress, of course, had to ratify the scheme. That was done by passage of what is officially known as PUBLIC LAW 357, which sets forth the following: "PUBLIC LAW 357 - 80th Congress . . . Chapter 482—1st Session

S.J. Res. 144—JOINT RESOLUTION

"Authorizing the President to bring into effect an agreement be-

tween the United States and the United Nations for the purpose of establishing the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in the United States and authorizing the taking of measures to facilitate compliance with the provisions of such agreement, and for other purposes."

This Public Law 357 is, in its entirety, the most amazing document I have ever read. There is only one comparison for it, to-wit: if, when Al Capone decided to make Chicago his headquarters, the Chicago Board of Aldermen had passed a Resolution authorizing the Mayor to set aside a square block in the heart of the city, to erect upon it the most imposing edifice that architects could dream up, furnish and equip it with every luxury available, surround it with complete protection against entry by city, State, or Federal authorities without Al's specific permission, and then hand it over to Capone to be the sacrosanct headquarters of the Capone Racket Syndicate, it would have read like "Public Law 357".

Limit of space prevents a re-print of it in its entirety. But there is one proviso in that document that has great significance. That proviso unmasked the original intent of the conspirators when they planted the UN within the U.S. It is the final provision, on page 13, and reads as follows:

"Sec. 6. Nothing in this agreement shall be construed as in any way diminishing, abridging, or weakening the right of the United States to safeguard its own security and completely to control the entrance of aliens into any of the territory in the United States other than the headquarters district and its immediate vicinity, as to be defined and fixed in a supplementary agreement between the Government of the United States and the United Nations in pursuance of section 13 (3) (E) of the agreement, and such areas as it is reasonably necessary to traverse in transit between the same and foreign countries. Moreover, nothing in section 14 of the agreement with respect to facilitating entrance into the United States by persons who wish to visit the headquarters district and do not enjoy the right of entry provided in section 11 of the agreement shall be construed to amend or suspend in any way the immigration laws of the United States or to commit the United States in any way to effect any amendment or suspension of such laws."

Now I am very sure that in those early days very few members of Congress, if any, so much as suspected the purposes for the planting of the UN within the U. S. The proviso quoted above was slipped in merely as a precautionary measure—as similar seemingly far-fetched precautionary measures are inserted in various agreements. At that time the UN was highly touted as a Holy of Holies,

and I doubt that that provision was inspired by any suspicious that it might be less than Holy—but it certainly touched a nerve center, as I shall show.

Now let's analyze the following clause in that proviso:

“. . . that nothing in the agreement shall . . . in any way diminish, abridge, or weaken the right of the United States to safe-guard its own security and completely to control the entrance of aliens . . .”

Now, just exactly what was that clause intended to mean? Well, among other things, it was intended to mean that no Red spies and saboteurs could enter the United States under the guise of UN personnel . . . it was intended to mean that no member of Moscow's delegation (or of her Satellites) to the UN could roam freely throughout our country to accomplish their various nefarious objectives . . . it was intended to mean that no MVD thugs could function in the United States under the guise of UN personnel.

That “Public Law 357” is the lease agreement, or contract, under which the UN could maintain its headquarters in this country. And, of course, to be valid, it had to be signed by both parties to the agreement. But when Trygvie Lie read that clause he objected furiously. He told George Marshall, our then Secretary of State, that the UN would not sign the agreement until that clause and all other restrictive measures were removed. Marshall knew that Congress (*it was the Republican 80th Congress*) would not budge—indeed, he knew that a demand for deletion of that clause might arouse suspicions and lead to the kind of questioning that the UN could not answer satisfactorily. He pointed that out to Lie and advised him to “forget” all about it and go ahead on the theory that nobody would ever ask if the UN had signed the agreement. Lie took the advice—and *the UN did not sign the agreement!*

Incidentally, this was the same George Marshall who couldn't remember where he was at the time the Japs attacked Pearl Harbor!

That story was told to me in March 1956 by a *very reliable official* in Government service. Despite the reliability of that individual I decided to do some personal research. In response to my questioning, another official in the State Department admitted that the UN had never ratified the agreement. When pressed for the reasons why it had not been signed, *that State Department official* brushed it all off by retorting that “*circumstances had never arisen to force the issue with the UN*”—and the UN blithely continued to function as if the “reservations” had been formally approved.

All of that means that the UN's rights of occupation of “the glass house that Hiss built” and the surrounding territory are, to say the

least, a shadowy matter. Without that agreement, properly signed and recorded, the UN has throughout all the years been a knowing and deliberate trespasser on American soil. It actually means that the very legal status of the UN is open to question—along with all of its decisions.

●

HOCUS POCUS?

●

Now, as I have stated, that story was revealed to me in March 1956, at the time I was in Washington to produce "Thieves' Paradise". In turn, I revealed it to others, among them a very inquisitive Massachusetts newspaper reporter—and a very good one. He decided to do his own investigating. And, lo and behold, about six months later, he informed me that he had been given a copy, *purportedly*, of that same "Public Law 357"—and that that copy shows that it *was* signed by the UN.

(NOTE: *My official copy of that document contains no such statement or signature!*)

Now, I had no opportunity to compare the reporter's copy of the document with the one I had in our files in Hollywood—the incident took place in Massachusetts. But according to my memory, there were some features missing in the reporter's copy—mainly in that "Sec. 6" of "reservations" clause. *And I do know that my copy does NOT show that it was signed by the UN !!!*

There may be a very simple answer for the variance in the two copies: in 1946 the State Department prepared an agreement under which the UN was to permanently headquarter in the United States. That agreement was signed by Trygve Lie for the UN and by Secretary Marshall for the U.S.

Naturally, under our laws, that agreement could not become valid until Congress officially approved it. But Lie and Marshall signed it anyway—on the assumption that Congress would approve it without any changes. But that assumption went awry when the new Congress—that *Republican 80th Congress*—scanned that agreement.

Actually that first agreement was in most respects identical with the later "Public Law 357". The chief—and *vital*—difference was that "Reservations" clause. But it was because of that clause that the UN, *purportedly on the advice of Marshall*, did not sign "Public Law 357"—and "carried on" under the pretense that the

unrevised original document was a sufficient arrangement.

What the State Department gave to that Massachusetts reporter could well be a copy of that unrevised original document!

However, strange as *this* may seem, I won't waste time or space in arguing about, or even questioning, the copy the State Department gave to that Massachusetts reporter. Nor am I concerned with *when* it was signed by the UN—if it was signed. Because if "Public Law 357", with its "Reservations" clause, had been signed when it was first submitted, or since then, it would make the case *against* the UN far stronger than if it had never been signed at all—as we shall soon see!

●

PROOF THAT UN IS MVD HDQS. IN U.S.

●

For the significance in the following we must bear in mind that the chief reason why Congress inserted that protective clause in "Public Law 357" was to prevent the funneling of Communist spies—and MVD agents—into the United States under the guise of UN personnel.

In April 1956 the press throughout the nation front paged the most startling and shocking story since the Pearl Harbor attack: twenty of Moscow's notorious MVD agents kidnapped five Russian sailors in various parts of New York and flew them out of Idlewild Airport right under the eyes of the New York police, of our Immigration authorities, and of other government officials.

I am sure that everybody remembers that shocking incident, but it was hushed up so quickly that I doubt if many are aware of the reprehensible features behind it. Following are a few of the more pertinent facts—facts that establish beyond even a remote doubt that the UN serves as a headquarters for Moscow's MVD.

Early in 1955 Nationalist China intercepted the Russian tanker "Taupse" loaded with munitions for Red China. The members of the crew were given a choice between return to Russia and asylum in Formosa or the United States. Nine sailors eagerly accepted asylum in the United States . . . but a few months later, five of those nine sailors, *who had been guaranteed protection*, were flown off for Finland from Idlewild Airport in New York enroute to the U.S.-S.R.—*kidnapped in broad daylight by MVD thugs posing as UN personnel!!!*

Now this entire kidnapping incident was not one of those sudden happenings out of the blue. It had all been planned months in advance. It was done with the knowledge and full approval of the UN—that is obvious, because the UN had *knowingly* sponsored those MVD thugs into the United States under the guise of UN personnel. Those MVD thugs began to hound the refugees from the very first day of their arrival in New York—and that, too, was commonly known, as the following indicates:

In December 1955, four months before the kidnapping, Leon Volkov, a "Newsweek" contributing Editor on Soviet affairs, and himself a Russian refugee, reported his conversations with eight of the sailors. They told him then how Moscow agents had been hounding them day and night to return to Russia. The agents, they said, alternated threats with promises—and ordered them to report to Arkady Sobelov, chief of the Moscow delegation, at his UN headquarters, where they would be provided with transportation. The sailors told Volkov they weren't frightened by the MVD agents' threats—they were confident that the United States authorities would protect them . . . *but the U.S. authorities didn't !!!* No U. S. Government or local agency did anything to prevent the kidnapping. Not only did they do nothing to prevent it, but two Agencies, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), headed by Allen Dulles, little brother of our *big* Secretary of State, and the Immigration Bureau, actually put themselves out to make things easy for the kidnapers. They authorized the sailors' departure after a routine seven-minute hearing to which no American, other than an inspector stationed at Idlewild and an interpreter, was admitted.

It was definitely established that those MVD agents worked with and under Arkady Sovelov—*protected by UN diplomatic immunity !!!* During the four days preceding the kidnapping, the sailors were lured by a combination of persuasion and threats to the headquarters of Moscow's U.N. delegation! When they finally cracked and agreed to return to Russia they were whisked off to the Immigration hearing in a cavalcade of eight Moscow-owned automobiles filled with MVD agents. After the hearing, as the kidnapped sailors waited for their plane, they were surrounded by twenty MVD thugs, who kept them from speaking to their friends. Those friends and reporters were violently thrust out of the building by the MVD thugs and warned that if they came back they would be shot down . . . *and American officials stood by and did nothing about it!* What is more horrifying is that when the story broke "little brother" Allen Dulles and various officials of the Immigration Service *admitted* that they had known all about the matter *from its inception*, but had not interfered with Sobelov and his MVD thugs for "diplomatic

reasons.”

Exactly how those five sailors were lured to the headquarters of the Soviet UN delegation, and there tortured and terrorized into accepting “repatriation”, has never been made entirely clear. Their former neighbors were afraid to talk freely because they feared the power of the MVD. Some of them asserted that they were “advised” *by our own government agents* not to discuss the case. The Russian, Polish and Balkan communities in and around New York City were completely terrorized.

“*But this is America*”, one reporter told one of the witnesses. “*You are safe enough here.*”

“*Were those boys safe enough here?*” the witness asked, “*What good did it do them to be in America?*”

That atrocity took place within our country! What would have happened if twenty of our FBI agents had attempted such a stunt in Moscow? They would have been mowed down right in the Airport! And Moscow would not even have deigned to explain. Yet, Allen Dulles, and our other government agencies permitted it to happen for “*diplomatic reasons.*”

What kind of a “*diplomatic reason*” could have been strong enough to have forced this once great and proud nation to accept that kind of degradation?—the answer lies in the kind of men into whose hands we have entrusted the security and the destiny of our nation.

And we wonder why the whole world hates and despises us! That one incident alone was enough to have lost for us the friendship—*and the respect*—of the whole world!

The most significant feature of the kidnapping of those five sailors is its startling resemblance to the “Genocide Treaty” that the U.N. and the Internationalists tried so frantically to sneak over on the U.S. Had they succeeded, every American who so much as breathed one word of loyalty for America could have been snatched out of this country and shipped off to Siberian slave labor camps exactly as those five were flown out—and our BIG BRAINS in Washington would not even have had to plead “*diplomatic reasons*” . . . under that GENOCIDE treaty, or any similar such treaty, the UN would have life and death control over the American people exactly as the banditti in the Kremlin have over the Russian people.

But now let's come back to that “Public Law 357”. Regardless of whether the UN signed that document or not, do we need further

proof that the UN is a brazen sanctuary for Red spies?—and a plant within the U.S. to destroy the sovereignty of our country? If so, here is still further proof:

SENATORS DEMAND OUSTER OF TOP UN RUSSIANS

Some of the Senators who saw “Thieves’ Paradise” on the opening night in Washington took seriously what they heard. It was also a strong reminder of that kidnapping outrage. The Internal Security subcommittee, headed by Senator Eastland, decided to take action. On May 24 (1956), just four days after they saw the play which charged the UN with being a grave menace to the U. S., that subcommittee demanded that the State Department ask for the recall of chief delegate Sobelov and first secretary Ekimov of the Soviet delegation to the “United Nations”.

A request for “recall” is tantamount to expulsion of diplomats from a host country. All diplomats thus declared *persona non grata* have *always* been promptly recalled by their governments.

Did the “United Nations” heed that demand? They did not! They scornfully ignored it. By that token, the UN served notice that our Congress does not have the authority or the power to expel from the United States any delegate to the UN or any other of its personnel—*not even if he is a proven spy or mortal foe of the U. S.* It is to be assumed, by that same token, that Congress does not have the authority or the power to bar entry of such an individual.

Did the State Department act on the Eastland Senate Committee’s “recall” demand? They did not! Instead, both the State Department and the White House applied all possible pressure on Eastland to “forget” his committee’s demand.

Why? Because the UN considers itself above and beyond all the laws of the United States . . . it is scornfully indifferent to all our requirements for the internal security of our country. And our Secretary of State, commonly known as “the misguided Missile”, and the counterfeit Napoleon in the White House don’t dare to make a public test of the UN’s defiance.

Diplomatic protocol requires the approval of the host government of all diplomatic representatives; and, for whatever the reason may be, every government in the world promptly recalls any Ambassador, Consul or Attache who is declared “undesirable”. But the UN rejects all such protocol—they reject all of our Immigration

laws—they flout all our domestic laws. In short the UN is a law all unto itself and insists upon complete immunity for *all* of its personnel—even if the crime is premeditated MURDER!

That is why Trygvie Lie refused to sign “Public Law 357” . . . that is why Arkady Sobelov, Moscow’s chief gangster at the UN, thumbs his nose at our Senate, and stays on in our land to plot its destruction . . . that’s why all the MVD thugs, protected by UN’s special “diplomatic immunity”, can freely roam our streets with utter disregard of police and traffic regulations. And if anybody has any doubts about all of the above appalling facts, I submit a recent article by George Sokolsky about another MURDER committed on our streets by another Communist delegate to the UN—the article speaks for itself.

“DEATH ON FIRST AVENUE

—by—

George E. Sokolsky

“Dr. Joza Brilej, Yugoslav ambassador to the United Nations, was blithely driving his car west on 66th street in New York. He went through a red light; he bumped into another car; he went upon the sidewalk, killed Mrs. Ruth La Bartunek who was gently minding her own business but who was pinned against a building by this Yugoslav ambassador’s car which he was driving.

“Immunity

Dr. Brilej was quite sorry and sent some emissaries to the La Bartunek family to ask if he could contribute to the funeral expenses. Beyond that he had no responsibility because he is entitled to diplomatic immunity by which is meant that he lives in our midst under extra-territoriality and is not subject to our laws.

“It is legal for him and for a few hundred other people connected with the United Nations to go through red lights. The police cannot arrest him because he has diplomatic immunity. He can bump into another car and damage it but nothing can be done about that; he cannot even be sued for damages because he is not subject to our laws.

“He can kill a woman, a mother of five children, but he cannot be arrested for murder or for reckless driving; the police may not investigate whether he was drunk or sober when he lost control of his car; the police may not even inquire as to whether he had a license to drive a car. He is a big shot, an ambassador and enjoys extra-territoriality which includes the right to kill a woman going into a grocery store.

"Ignore Laws

"Of course, a man may be a diplomat and a gentleman, too. That has happened. Such a person would obey the traffic regulations of the place where he happened to be stationed because a gentleman does not take advantage of his position.

"But it is too much to expect of the folks who have been thrown into high position by war and revolution that they would even know the meaning of noblesse oblige. So they go through red lights. They park their cars in front of fire hydrants. They double park and triple park to the inconvenience of taxpaying Americans and now one has actually run down and killed an American woman. He killed her on a sidewalk as she was walking into a store.

"It is an easy-going, soft people that takes that sort of thing lying down. There was a time when Americans were less refined and when somebody's fist would have settled this question of diplomatic immunity.

"No Protest

"What happens to all these heroes in our westerns which millions follow every day on television, these heroic characters who protect womanhood and motherhood and virtue? Do they not inculcate a sense of obligation to stand up for what is right? Or must we let these frisky ambassadors imperil our wives and children while they break every traffic law with cars bearing DPL license plates? DPL, indeed!

"The least the State Department can do is to notify the Yugoslav ambassador that the streets of New York are closed to him. He can remain in the United Nations Building as long as Tito wants to keep him there, but he has committed a homicide on New York streets and the streets are closed to him. Of course, the State Department will do no such thing because its personnel is made up of diplomats who do not speak rudely to diplomats and who believe in extra-territoriality because when they go to other countries, they live by it.

"But Tito did not always practice it and as I recall, when our ambassador to Yugoslavia was Richard C. Patterson, Jr., Tito was rude to him and his lovely wife and nobody made much of a fuss about that because, I presume, it was expected that Tito would be rude. That was before Tito was kicked out of the Cominform by Stalin and turned his face westward to get a cool billion of the American taxpayers' dollars.

"May I suggest to Senator Green and Representative Gordon of

the Senate and House committees dealing with foreign affairs that they might hold public hearings into the misconduct of foreign officials in New York. They would get an earful and the public would discover that when the striped pants came off, some of these fellows are no better than they were before the revolution."

Mr. Sokolsky's suggestion to Senator Green and Representative Gordon is not only excellent, but imperative. The entire UN monstrosity should get a *thorough* investigation by both Houses of Congress . . . and it *will* if the American people *demand* it. I urge every American who has the salvation of our country in his heart to follow up Mr. Sokolsky's article by writing to his Senator and Representative—and DEMAND a thorough investigation of *every* phase of the UN.

THE SO-CALLED "CIVIL RIGHTS BILL"

It is now generally known that the craftiest technique developed by the Great Conspiracy for the chipping away of our Freedoms as provided by our Constitution, and thus gradually to destroy the Constitution as a whole, is through so-called Treaties, such as "Genocide"—through Executive Agreements, such as the reprehensible "Status of Forces" which is destroying the morale and loyalty of our Armed Services—through that fantastic and vicious de-segregation decision handed down by Earl Warren, *at the behest of Eisenhower*, neither of whom would permit his grandchildren to attend a de-segregated school—through the proposed Mental Health laws, etc., etc.

The above is apropos of the so-called "Civil Rights Bill", which has had both houses of Congress in a continuous uproar during most of this session. This Bill has been declared a MUST by Eisenhower; all Leftwing groups are pressing for it; NAACP and the "Anti-Defamation League" are clamoring for it. And, of course, it is urgently endorsed by such anti-American "gentlemen" as Paul Hoffman, Wonder-Boy Hutchins, Henry Cabot Lodge (no longer "Jr."), and all of that ilk. The particular feature in this mis-named "Civil Rights Bill" is the one which would deprive the American people of the Constitutional right to trial by Jury.

In effect, this so-called "Civil Rights Bill" is tantamount to the present "Status of Forces" treaties which deprive American soldiers stationed in foreign lands of *their* Constitutional rights — which

“treaties”, let us devoutly hope, will be completely unmasked by the present Girard case.

Under the “Status of Forces” treaties the American soldier stationed in foreign lands (*where he is supposedly serving his country*) who commits a crime *or a misdemeanor* is turned over to the mercies of the courts of those foreign lands . . . under this “Civil Rights Bill” all American citizens who commit certain types of “crimes”, such as, for one example, refusal to obey the Warren de-segregation decision, would be denied his right to a trial by jury.

With the kind of Judiciary we now have in our country, especially in the Federal branch, it is not necessary to stress the grave menace in this “Civil Rights Bill”—if passed by Congress, it would, in effect, be a domestic “Genocide Treaty”.

Fortunately, there are a number of Senators and Representatives who are fully cognizant of the “trap” in this “Civil Rights Bill” and are staunchly opposing it. But there are others, such as Left-Wingers Wayne Morse, Neuberger, Hubert Humphrey, and the others of that ilk, who are fully aware of the “trap” and are gleefully backing it. In addition, there are many others who have not properly studied the Bill and who have fallen for the pressures of the “humanitarian” groups. Therefore, it is up to all of us who are fighting for the preservation of our Constitution and the salvation of our country to come to the support of those men in both Houses of Congress who are fighting to defeat the Bill. The best way to support them is by writing to your Senators and Representatives—an avalanche of letters will do to the “Civil Rights Bill” what our letters have been doing to Eisenhower’s Budget.

Tell them that “*by their deeds shall they be judged*” in the voting booths in 1958—that is the kind of language they best understand.

FOLLOW THIS DEDICATED AMERICAN’S EXAMPLE

The following letter, written by Mr. George B. Fowler, of Holyoke, Massachusetts, is self-explanatory:

“May 16, 1957

“*Congressman William M. Colmer
Rules Committee
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.*

"Dear Congressman Colmer:

"I see by the papers that early next week your Rules Committee intends to vote on the so-called Civil Rights Bill. Unquestionably, you have given this proposed legislation very careful study, but if what I have read about these Civil Rights proposals is true it would seem that the pending bill contains some dangerous provisions.

"According to the press, charges have been made by members of Congress that this proposed law would deny accused persons the right of trial by jury. From sources which I consider completely reliable, I am informed that an amendment which would have insured that this fundamental Constitutional right would be protected was defeated by a secret vote in a meeting of the House Judiciary Committee.

"If the Rules Committee sends this bill to the floor for action, will it contain such a provision to protect Constitutional rights? Or can such an amendment be offered on the floor, and will members of the House be called upon to publicly register their votes on this issue? "If this is a true Civil Rights Bill, does the House version provide that all citizens shall have the right to work, without first being compelled to join a labor union and pay tribute in order to enjoy that right?"

"I will be pleased to have your views.

*"Sincerely yours,
"George B. Fowler"*

Mr. Fowler sent duplicates of the above letter to all the members of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives, who are:

Democrats: Howard W. Smith, Virginia; Ray J. Madden, Ind.;
James J. Delaney, N.Y.; James W. Trimble, Ark.;
Homer Thornberry, Tex.; Richard Bolling, Mo.;
Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Mass.

Republicans: Leo E. Allen, Ill.; Clarence J. Brown, Ohio;
Henry J. Latham, N. Y.; Hugh Scott, Penn.

In addition, Mr. Fowler sent the following letter to ALL the other Members of Congress:

"As a conscientious citizen I am greatly concerned about charges by members of Congress and other outstanding leaders that the pending Civil Rights bills contain provisions that would deny certain fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution, especially the right of trial by jury.

“Members of Congress swear to uphold the Constitution, and yet, from a source which I consider highly reliable, I am informed that members of the Judiciary Committees of both Houses voted to reject amendments which would guarantee that the right of trial by jury would be protected. Is this true?”

“Other charges made available to me by the same source seem unbelievable, but if they are untrue certainly some sponsors of the legislation would have vigorously denied them. I have seen no such denials. Could you tell me specifically if any statements are false?”
“Furthermore, I would respectfully suggest that if a Civil Rights Law is necessary that it protect all rights of all citizens, especially the right to work, without first being compelled to join a labor union and pay tribute in order to enjoy that right.

“I will be pleased to have your comments.

*“Very sincerely yours,
“George B. Fowler.”*

Since Mr. Fowler wrote those letters I have had voluminous reports from our Washington contacts, and I am truly amazed and gratified by the results they achieved. I am informed that a considerable number of Senators and Representatives who had previously been in favor of this “Civil Rights Bill”, *especially because of urgings from Eisenhower*, have taken a second look at it—and joined the *opposition!*

Now, during the past months I have been receiving many, *many* letters from disturbed members of CEG, as also from non-members, urging CEG to take action against this “Civil Rights Bill”, as also against the “Mental Health” and other similar vicious Bills. We *have* taken action! But it is the individual, personal letter that gets the attention of Senators and Representatives *because it means VOTES!* Therefore, I urge YOU to follow Mr. Fowler’s example—write similar letters to *your* Senators and Representatives. Tell them *in your own language* how you want them to represent YOU. That is what they are there for: to represent YOU, not to obey Eisenhower and his Internationalist Masters!

Also, write to the members of the Rules and Judiciary Committees of both Houses.

REPORT ON "CONSTITUTION PARTY"

During the past few months, especially since the last Presidential election, we have been getting a flood of inquiries about the "Constitution Party".

Some of the writers are honestly seeking information; some of the letters are tinged with sarcasm; some are outright—and *bitter*—criticism by obviously disillusioned and disappointed one-time workers for the Party. Lacking sufficient space in this issue, we will render a full and complete report in our next one.

But there is one statement I wish to make in advance of that report: and that is that we desperately need a new Party. This writer has been *crying* for one ever since the Internationalists captured the Republican Party in 1952. But creating a new *national* political party is a far cry from organizing a little community civic club, or hostessing a sewing circle Koffee Klatch. Having had considerable experience in the game of national politics, I know what a new party must do and must *not* do, and what kind of leadership it must have, to achieve the respect and confidence of the people. For that reason our report will be utterly impersonal. It will be factual and objective. It will highlight its virtues—and stress its defects. That's the only way this kind of a report can be constructive. And I do want it to be constructive—because we *do* desperately need a *good* new national political party, whether it be called Constitution or any other name.

CPA BOOK PUBLISHER

P. O. BOX 596
BORING, OR 97009